UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA WESTERN DIVISION

LACHANTAL W. RICKETTS, Plaintiff,)
) Case No: 5:15-CV-293-D
v.)
)
)
LOGICS, LLC, d/b/a LOGICS SOLUTIONS)
Defendants.) .

ORDER TO STAY DISCOVERY

This matter comes before the court on the Motion to Stay Discovery filed jointly by Plaintiff Lachantal Ricketts and Defendant Logics, LLC., d/b/a Logics Solutions, pending resolution of Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, filed on September 30, 2016, and the consideration of Defendant's Memorandum of Law in Support of Motion to Dismiss and Plaintiff's Memorandum of Law in Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Dismiss by the Court.

Rule 26(c) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure authorizes a court to issue an order limiting or staying discovery. Specifically, a court has discretion to stay discovery until the court's resolution of pending dispositive motions. See <u>Yongo v. Nationwide Affinity Ins. Co.</u> of Am., No. 5:07-CV-94-D, 2008 WL 516744, at *2 (E.D.N.C. Feb. 25, 2008) (unpublished); <u>Tilley v. United States</u>, 270 F. Supp. 2d 731, 734 (M.D.N.C. 2003).

In certain cases, a stay of discovery may be appropriate to prevent a waste of time and resources by the parties and to make efficient use of judicial resources. <u>United States v. A. T. Massey Coal Co.</u>, No. 2:07-0299, 2007 WL 3051449, at *2 (S.D. W.Va. Oct. 18, 2007) (unpublished).

Accordingly, (1) the deadlines set forth in the existing discovery plan regarding this matter should be STAYED pending the court's ruling on Defendants' motion to dismiss; and (2) within 14 days following the court's ruling on the motion to dismiss the parties shall resume discovery.

SO ORDERED. This 28 day of December 2016.

JAMES C. DEVER III

Chief United States District Judge